



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/763,162	01/26/2004	Naoyuki Nagao	1713.1010	6723
21171	7590	10/29/2008		
STAAS & HALSEY LLP SUITE 700 1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20005			EXAMINER CHRISTENSEN, SCOTT B	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2444	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/29/2008	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/763,162

**Applicant(s)**

NAGAO, NAOYUKI

**Examiner**

Scott Christensen

**Art Unit**

2444

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 June 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7, 9-14, 16-22, 24-30 and 32 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7, 9-14, 16-22, 24-30 and 32 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/888)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This Office Action is in regards to the most recent papers filed on 9/18/2008.
2. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 9/18/2008 has been entered.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

4. Claims 1-7, 9-14, 16-22, 25-30, and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.
5. With regard to claim 1, the instant claim includes the limitation, "an examining unit that examines transmission and reception data generated between the terminal and the hardware port of the information processing device to determine whether the transmission and reception data are to be accumulated as logs." The specification does

not appear to provide support for the actual transmission and reception data being examined to determine if the data is to be accumulated as logs. For example, page 28, lines 10-16 discloses that the data control unit examines whether the received data are to be accumulated as logs, but there is no disclosure as to what is examined. Applicant should distinctly indicate the portion of the instant specification that discloses that the transmission and reception data is examined to determine if the transmission and reception data is to be accumulated as logs. Claims 13, 16, 17, and 25 are substantially similar to claim 1, and are rejected for the same. Claims 2-7, 9-12, 14, 17-22, 26-30, and 32, which depend from claims 1, 13, 16, 17, or 25 are rejected for the same.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1, 5, 7-11, 13, 17, 18, 21, 25, 26, 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicants Admitted Prior Art (hereafter "AAPA") in view of Nagaraj (US Pat. No. 6947415) hereafter "Nagaraj" and further in view of North et al. (US Pat. No. 6505245) hereafter "North".

8. Regarding Claim 1, AAPA discloses, a console switch that selectively connects a terminal to a hardware port of an information processing device that has a plurality of hardware ports connected through a network (see e.g. Fig 1 & background), the console

switch comprising: a first unit that obtains information from the terminal, the information specifying the hardware port of the information processing device to be connected, establishes a connection path between the terminal and the hardware port of the information processing device (see e.g. Fig 2). However AAPA does not explicitly teach a second unit that refers to a predetermined database in accordance with the information obtained by the first unit, an examining unit that examines transmission and reception data generated between the terminal and the hardware port of the information processing device in order to determine whether the transmission and reception data are to be accumulated as logs; and a memory unit that stores transmission and reception data generated between the terminal and the port of the information processing device.

In the same field of endeavor, Nagaraj teaches (see e.g. Abstract lines 3-6 & Fig 2, 240) a routing table that is maintained by (see e.g. Abstract lines 3-6 & Fig 2, 260) a processing unit, which is the functional equivalent of second unit claimed in claim 1 above.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the networking art at the time the applicant's invention was made to combine Nagaraj's teaching of routine table which is maintained by a routing processing unit with the teachings of AAPA, for the purpose of (see Nagaraj, Col. 1, Lines 34-37) increasing the speed of a routing switch while decreasing the internal complexity of the component communications. AAPA provides motivation to do so, by connecting the terminal to different servers to be able

to TELNET to them (see applicant background of invention, Page 4, Line 31-32 & Page 5, lines 7-8).

However, a person of ordinary skill in the art would have known how to examine the transmission and reception data generated between the terminal and hardware port of the information processing device in order to determine whether the transmission and reception data are to be accumulated as logs. Evidence of this may be found in US Patent 5,675,510 to Coffey et al., hereafter referred to as "Coffey." Coffey discloses examining communications for certain strings, and storing select information when the strings are found (Coffey: Column 2, lines 35-50).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the networking art at the time the applicant's invention was made to combine North's teaching as discussed above with the teachings of AAPA & Nagaraj, for the purpose of (see North, Col. 2, Lines 31-35) to enable a system administrator to manage disparate manageable devices form a single location. AAPA provides motivation to do so, by connecting the terminal to different servers to be able to TELNET to them (see applicant background of invention, Page 4, Line 31-32 & Page 5, lines 7-8). Further, logging only certain information allows the log file to only include information that is determined to be necessary based on the criteria used to filter the communications. This allows the storage space of the log file to be utilized more efficiently, reducing the chances of pertinent information being dropped due to an overfilled log. Further, when the log is analyzed, the system administrator only needs to review more pertinent information rather than each and every communication.

9. Regarding Claim 5, AAPA-Nagaraj-North disclose the invention substantially as claimed. AAPA further discloses a notification message, which shows when a connection to the terminal has been established which is the functional equivalent of the fifth element (see e.g. Fig 6 & background).

10. Regarding Claim 7, AAPA-Nagaraj-North disclose the invention substantially as claimed. However AAPA-Nagaraj do not explicitly teach the predetermined database is managed as a text file.

In the same field of endeavor, North teaches the information maintained in the memory of the devices, is kept as text string (see e.g. Col. 2, lines 57-61).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the networking art at the time the applicant's invention was made to combine North's teaching of memory maintaining the information in a text form with the teachings of AAPA & Nagaraj, for the purpose of (see North, Col. 2, Lines 31-35) to enable a system administrator to manage disparate manageable devices form a single location. AAPA provides motivation to do so, by connecting the terminal to different servers to be able to TELNET to them (see applicant background of invention, Page 4, Line 31-32 & Page 5, lines 7-8).

11. Regarding Claim 9, AAPA-Nagaraj-North disclose the invention substantially as claimed. However AAPA-Nagaraj do not explicitly teach the memory unit stores messages to be outputted on to a screen of the terminal.

In the same field of endeavor, North teaches the memory subsystem capable of storing logs of all accesses and actions performed on the computing devices to be outputted onto a screen of the terminal (see e.g. Fig. 5, 124 & abstract lines 9-10).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the networking art at the time the applicant's invention was made to combine North's teaching as discussed above with the teachings of AAPA & Nagaraj, for the purpose of (see North, Col. 2, Lines 31-35) to enable a system administrator to manage disparate manageable devices form a single location. AAPA provides motivation to do so, by connecting the terminal to different servers to be able to TELNET to them (see applicant background of invention, Page 4, Line 31-32 & Page 5, lines 7-8).

12. Regarding Claim 10, AAPA-Nagaraj-North disclose the invention substantially as claimed. However AAPA-Nagaraj do not explicitly teach the memory unit stores data outputted from the hardware port of the information processing device.

In the same field of endeavor, North teaches the memory subsystem capable of storing logs of all accesses and actions performed on the computing devices to be outputted onto a screen of the terminal (see e.g. Fig. 5, 124 & abstract lines 9-10).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the networking art at the time the applicant's invention was made to combine North's teaching as discussed above with the teachings of AAPA & Nagaraj, for the purpose of (see North, Col. 2, Lines 31-35) to enable a system administrator to manage disparate manageable devices form a single location. AAPA provides motivation to do so, by connecting the



terminal to different servers to be able to TELNET to them (see applicant background of invention, Page 4, Line 31-32 & Page 5, lines 7-8).

13. Regarding Claim 11, AAPA-Nagaraj-North disclose the invention substantially as claimed. However AAPA-Nagaraj do not explicitly teach the memory unit stores the transmission and reception data in association with one of a date, a terminal path, user information, and a server connection path.

In the same field of endeavor, North teaches the memory subsystem capable of storing logs of all accesses and actions performed on the computing devices to be outputted onto a screen of the terminal (see e.g. Fig. 5, 124 & abstract lines 9-10).

14. Regarding Claim 13, AAPA discloses, a system (see e.g. Fig 1 & background) comprising: a terminal (see e.g. Fig. 1, 701); an information processing device that has a plurality of hardware ports (see e.g. Fig.1, 710), a console switch that selectively connects a terminal to a port of an information processing device that has a plurality of ports connected through a network (see e.g. Fig.1, 100), the console switch comprising: a first unit that obtains information from the terminal, the information specifying the port of the information processing device to be connected, and establishes a connection path between the terminal and the hardware port of the information processing device (see e.g. Fig 2). However AAPA does not explicitly teach a second unit that refers to a predetermined database in accordance with the port information obtained by the first unit; an examining unit that examines transmission and reception data generated

between the terminal and the hardware port of the information processing device in order to determine whether the transmission and reception data are to be accumulated as logs; and a memory unit that stores transmission and reception data generated between the terminal and the port of the information processing device.

In the same field of endeavor, Nagaraj teaches a routing table (Abstract lines 3-6 & Fig 2, 240) that is maintained by a processing unit, which is the functional equivalent of second unit claimed in claim 13 above (Abstract lines 3-6 & Fig 2, 260).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the networking art at the time the applicant's invention was made to combine Nagaraj's teaching of routine table which is maintained by a routing processing unit with the teachings of AAPA, for the purpose of (see Nagaraj, Col. 1, Lines 34-37) increasing the speed of a routing switch while decreasing the internal complexity of the component communications. AAPA provides motivation to do so, by connecting the terminal to different servers to be able to TELNET to them (see applicant background of invention, Page 4, Line 31-32 & Page 5, lines 7-8).

However, a person of ordinary skill in the art would have known how to examine the transmission and reception data generated between the terminal and hardware port of the information processing device in order to determine whether the transmission and reception data are to be accumulated as logs. Evidence of this may be found in US Patent 5,675,510 to Coffey et al., hereafter referred to as "Coffey." Coffey discloses examining communications for certain strings, and storing select information when the strings are found (Coffey: Column 2, lines 35-50). North further teaches the

memory subsystem capable of storing logs of all accesses and actions performed on the computing devices in the allocated space 124 (see e.g. Fig. 5, 124 & abstract lines 9-10).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the networking art at the time the applicant's invention was made to combine North's teaching as discussed above with the teachings of AAPA & Nagaraj, for the purpose of (see North, Col. 2, Lines 31-35) to enable a system administrator to manage disparate manageable devices form a single location. AAPA provides motivation to do so, by connecting the terminal to different servers to be able to TELNET to them (see applicant background of invention, Page 4, Line 31-32 & Page 5, lines 7-8). Further, logging only certain information allows the log file to only include information that is determined to be necessary based on the criteria used to filter the communications. This allows the storage space of the log file to be utilized more efficiently, reducing the chances of pertinent information being dropped due to an overfilled log. Further, when the log is analyzed, the system administrator only needs to review more pertinent information rather than each and every communication.

15. Claim 17 list all the same elements of claim 1, but in method form rather than system form. Therefore, the supporting rationale of the rejection to claim 1 applies equally as well to claim 17.

16. Claim 18 list all the same elements of claim 2, but in method form rather than system form. Therefore, the supporting rationale of the rejection to claim 2 applies equally as well to claim 18.

17. Claim 21 list all the same elements of claim 5, but in method form rather than system form. Therefore, the supporting rationale of the rejection to claim 5 applies equally as well to claim 21.

18. Claim 25 list all the same elements of claim 1, but in computer program product form rather than system form. Therefore, the supporting rationale of the rejection to claim 1 applies equally as well to claim 25.

19. Claim 26 list all the same elements of claim 2, but in computer program product form rather than system form. Therefore, the supporting rationale of the rejection to claim 2 applies equally as well to claim 26.

20. Claim 29 list all the same elements of claim 5, but in computer program product form rather than system form. Therefore, the supporting rationale of the rejection to claim 5 applies equally as well to claim 29.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

21. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over AAPA-Nagaraj-North as applied to Claims 1 above and further in view of Gallagher et al. (US PG Pub. No. 2003/0002492) hereafter "Gallagher".

22. Regarding Claim 2, AAPA-Nagaraj-North disclose the invention substantially as claimed. However AAPA-Nagaraj-North do not explicitly teach a third unit that automatically connects to each hardware port of the information processing device after activation of the console switch.

In the same field of endeavor, Gallagher teaches a switch is a device capable of providing on demand, anything-to-anything connections between attached devices. A switch typically provides a number of ports to which external devices may attach. The switch provides the ability to dynamically connect any port to any other port, thereby enabling any attached device to communicate with any other attached device. Switches may be used to accomplish direct connections between devices, or switches may be combined in cascaded or chained topologies in order to increase the total number of ports within the network, or to increase the allowable physical distance between connected devices, which is the functional equivalent of the third unit (see e.g. Page 1, ¶0003, lines 4-15).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the networking art at the time the applicant's invention was made to combine Gallagher's teaching of a switches ability to provide connectivity between ports of devices connected to it with the teachings of AAPA-Nagaraj-North, for the purpose of (see Gallagher, Page 2, ¶0008, lines 3-6) to enable enabling a switch to provide to a requesting device sufficient

information for the requesting device to determine the specific ports for which the requesting device should update its local port configuration data. AAPA provides motivation to do so, by connecting the terminal to different servers to be able to TELNET to them (see applicant background of invention, Page 4, Line 31-32 & Page 5, lines 7-8).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

23. Claims 3, 4, 6, 12, 14, 16, 19, 20, 22, 24, 27, 28, 30, 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over AAPA-Nagaraj-North, as applied to claims 1, 13, 17, 25 above and further in view of Duvvury (US Pat. No. 6917626) hereafter "Duvvury".

24. Regarding Claim 3, AAPA-Nagaraj-North disclose the invention substantially as claimed. However AAPA-Nagaraj-North do not explicitly teach a fourth unit that, after activation of the console switch, obtains the MAC address and the IP address of the information processing device, associate the MAC address and the IP address of the information processing device with the information, and stores the MAC address and the IP address associated with the information in the predetermined database.

In the same field of endeavor, Duvvury teaches learning the MAC address and storing it in the memory ( see e.g. Col. 4, lines 11-15 & Fig. 2B), poll devices on the network for specific information (see e.g. Col. 9, lines 6-8).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the networking art at the time the applicant's invention was made to combine Duvvury's teaching of learning

specific information from devices on the network as such as MAC address and storing it in memory with the teachings of AAPA-Nagaraj-North, for the purpose of (see Duvvury, Col. 6, Lines 46-50) to allow management of all the network devices in a cluster using a single IP address. AAPA provides motivation to do so, by connecting the terminal to different servers to be able to TELNET to them (see applicant background of invention, Page 4, Line 31-32 & Page 5, lines 7-8).

25. Regarding Claim 4, AAPA-Nagaraj-North disclose the invention substantially as claimed. However AAPA-Nagaraj-North do not explicitly teach when a connection path has not yet been established between the terminal and the hardware port of the information processing device corresponding to the information obtained by the first unit, the second unit detects the IP address from the MAC address of the information processing device corresponding to the obtained information.

In the same field of endeavor, Duvvury teaches learning the MAC address and storing it in the memory (see e.g. Col. 4, lines 11-15 & Fig. 2B), poll devices on the network for specific information (see e.g. Col. 9, lines 6-8).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the networking art at the time the applicant's invention was made to combine Duvvury's teaching of obtaining specific information from devices on the network such as MAC address with the teachings of AAPA-Nagaraj-North, for the purpose of (see Duvvury, Col. 6, Lines 46-50) to allow management of all the network devices in a cluster using a single IP address. AAPA provides motivation to do so, by connecting the terminal to different servers to be

able to TELNET to them (see applicant background of invention, Page 4, Line 31-32 & Page 5, lines 7-8).

26. Regarding Claim 6, AAPA-Nagaraj-North disclose the invention substantially as claimed. However AAPA-Nagaraj-North do not explicitly teach the information includes a port number allocated to the hardware port of the information processing device, or a port name allocated to the hardware port of the information processing device.

In the same field of endeavor, Duvvury teaches poll devices on the network for specific information (see e.g. Col. 9, lines 6-8).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the networking art at the time the applicant's invention was made to combine Duvvury's teaching of polling the devices for specific information with the teachings of AAPA-Nagaraj-North, for the purpose of (see Duvvury, Col. 6, Lines 46-50) to allow management of all the network devices in a cluster using a single IP address. AAPA provides motivation to do so, by connecting the terminal to different servers to be able to TELNET to them (see applicant background of invention, Page 4, Line 31-32 & Page 5, lines 7-8).

27. Regarding Claim 12, the same limitation is addressed in claim 3 above. The same grounds of rejection apply to claim 12 as was applied to claim 3. The tuning button manually performs the same task as was performed in claim 3. Having two identical devices connected to the network allows for the multiple manual tuning buttons.



28. Regarding Claim 14, AAPA-Nagaraj-North disclose the invention substantially as claimed. However AAPA-Nagaraj-North do not explicitly teach the information processing device is cascade-connected.

In the same field of endeavor, Duvvury teaches two cascaded console switches (see e.g. Col. 5, lines 45-46 & 50-51 & Fig. 4).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the networking art at the time the applicant's invention was made to combine Duvvury's teaching of cascading console switches with the teachings of AAPA-Nagaraj-North, for the purpose of (see Duvvury, Col. 6, Lines 46-50) to allow management of all the network devices in a cluster using a single IP address. AAPA provides motivation to do so, by connecting the terminal to different servers to be able to TELNET to them (see applicant background of invention, Page 4, Line 31-32 & Page 5, lines 7-8).

29. Regarding Claim 16, AAPA-Nagaraj-North disclose the invention substantially as claimed. However AAPA-Nagaraj-North do not teach a system comprising: a first console switch; and a second console switch that is connected to the first console switch through a network.

In the same field of endeavor, Duvvury teaches two cascaded console switches (see e.g. Col. 5, lines 45-46 & 50-51 & Fig. 4).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the networking art at the time the applicant's invention was made to combine Duvvury's teaching of cascading

console switches with the teachings of AAPA-Nagaraj-North, for the purpose of (see Duvvury, Col. 6, Lines 46-50) to allow management of all the network devices in a cluster using a single IP address. AAPA provides motivation to do so, by connecting the terminal to different servers to be able to TELNET to them (see applicant background of invention, Page 4, Line 31-32 & Page 5, lines 7-8).

30. Claim 19 list all the same elements of claim 3, but in method form rather than system form. Therefore, the supporting rationale of the rejection to claim 3 applies equally as well to claim 19.

31. Claim 20 list all the same elements of claim 4, but in method form rather than system form. Therefore, the supporting rationale of the rejection to claim 4 applies equally as well to claim 20.

32. Claim 22 list all the same elements of claim 6, but in method form rather than system form. Therefore, the supporting rationale of the rejection to claim 6 applies equally as well to claim 22.

33. Claim 24 list all the same elements of claim 3, but in method form rather than system form. Therefore, the supporting rationale of the rejection to claim 3 applies equally as well to claim 24.

34. Claim 27 list all the same elements of claim 3, but in computer program product form rather than system form. Therefore, the supporting rationale of the rejection to claim 3 applies equally as well to claim 27.

35. Claim 28 list all the same elements of claim 3, but in computer program product form rather than system form. Therefore, the supporting rationale of the rejection to claim 3 applies equally as well to claim 28.

36. Claim 30 list all the same elements of claim 6, but in computer program product form rather than system form. Therefore, the supporting rationale of the rejection to claim 6 applies equally as well to claim 30.

37. Claim 32 list all the same elements of claim 3, but in computer program product form rather than system form. Therefore, the supporting rationale of the rejection to claim 3 applies equally as well to claim 32.

#### ***Response to Arguments***

38. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-7, 9-14, 16-22, 25-30, and 32 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

**Conclusion**

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Scott Christensen whose telephone number is (571)270-1144. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday 6:30AM - 4:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Vaughn can be reached on (571) 272-3922. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Paul H Kang/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2444

/S. C./  
Examiner, Art Unit 2444